CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

| Investigator: | | Team: | CCRB Case #: | $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ | Force | | Discourt. | U.S. | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------|------------|--|
| Daniel Gavin | | Squad #1 | 201809099 | Ø | Abuse | | O.L. | ☐ Injury | |
| Incident Date(s) | | Location of Incident: | | P | recinct: | 18 | Mo. SOL | EO SOL | |
| Thursday, 10/18/2018 9:45 AM | | Grover Cleveland Parl | k | | 104 4/18/2020 | | 12/3/2020 | | |
| Date/Time CV Reported | | CV Reported At: | How CV Reported | : | Date/Time | Rece | eived at CCI | RB | |
| Wed, 10/24/2018 7:38 AM | | IAB Phone Th | | | Thu, 11/01 | Thu, 11/01/2018 11:01 AM | | | |
| Complainant/Victim | Type | Home Addr | ess | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Subject Officer(s) | Shield | TaxID | Command | | | | | | |
| 1. POM Louis Marinacci | 22579 | 941229 | 104 PCT | | | | | | |
| 2. DTS Anthony Wright | 4255 | 935991 | 104 PCT | | | | | | |
| Officer(s) | Allegati | on | | | Inve | estiga | ator Recon | nmendation | |
| A.DTS Anthony Wright | Abuse: Detective Anthony Wright stopped § 87(2)(b) | | | | | | | | |
| B.POM Louis Marinacci | Abuse: Police Officer Louis Marinacci stopped § 87(2)(b) | | | | | | | | |
| C.POM Louis Marinacci | Force: Police Officer Louis Marinacci used physical force against § 87(2)(b) | | | | | | | | |
| D.POM Louis Marinacci | Abuse: Police Officer Louis Marinacci damaged § 87(2)(b) s property. | | | | | | | | |
| E.POM Louis Marinacci | Abuse: Police Officer Louis Marinacci interfered with s use of a recording device. | | | | | | | | |
| F.POM Louis Marinacci | Abuse: I name to | Police Officer Louis Ma § 87(2)(b) | rinacci refused to pro | ovide | e his | | | | |

Case Summary

| On October 24, 20 | 18, § 87(2)(b) | filed this complaint with the | e Internal Affairs |
|---|--|--|---|
| Bureau, on behalf | | 17 years old at the | |
| incident. It was ref | erred to the CCRB, whe | re it was received on November 1, 20 |)18. |
| times at the number stated that \$87(2)(b) and could not be constant \$87(2)(b) \$87(2)(b) \$97(2)(b) \$97(2)(b | provided a phone st confirm was broken, and confirm mber. Upon determining 018, \$87(2)(b) cemail messages were less address. \$87(2)(c) letters. On December 10 requested that he compared to pursue him is a part of the confirmation of the confirmat | answered three of d not speak at each of the times that so cell phone. On November 29, 2018, atement and scheduled a field interviewed that he could not be contacted vined that the best method of contacting that a conflict existed at the schedule was called four additional tinft during each of these calls, and letter | ew for December a his cell phone g him was via his ed interview time hes to reschedule ers were sent to d to any of these 18 if 3.2 |
| Squad No.: | | | |
| Investigator: | Signature | Print Title & Name | Date |
| Squad Leader: | Signatura | Print Title & Name | Doto |
| | Signature | Print Title & Name | Date |
| Reviewer: | Signature | Print Title & Name | Date |

Page 2

CCRB Case # 201809099